#### Immigration reform is likely to pass USA Today 4-23[[1]](#footnote-1)

"I hope he has a chance to get a word in edgewise," Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., said. "We'll have a lot to say." Obama has hosted one dinner with a small group of Republican senators and another of Democratic ones in an effort to forge closer ties in Congress as he pushes his second-term agenda. Now he is joining one of the few enduring bipartisan conclaves on Capitol Hill, the regular dinner series held by the growing number of female members of the Senate. On the agenda: trying to reach a compromise budget deal and the prospects for passing a comprehensive immigration bill this year. **Klobuchar**, interviewed for the USA TODAY video series "Capital Download," **rejected the suggestion by some Republican senators that the Boston** Marathon **bombing** — thought to be the work of two Chechen immigrants — **was a reason to reconsider an immigration overhaul.** "I don't think it's a reason to slow it down," she said. "**I think it's actually a reason to make reforms," underscoring the need to more closely track "who gets in here and how they get in and who they are."** Those urging a slowdown "were going to oppose the immigration bill anyway, is my guess." She said **the odds of passing an immigration overhaul "are incredibly high" in the wake of a proposal unveiled last week by the so-called** Gang of Eight, four Republican and four Democratic senators**. But hopes for passing a gun-control bill have faded**, especially after supporters last week couldn't muster the 60 votes necessary for a bipartisan plan sponsored by Sens. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., and Pat Toomey, R- Pa., to expand background checks of gun buyers.

The aff slaughters Obama’s pol cap. Trinick[[2]](#footnote-2) in 12

#### It’s politically toxic. Any move to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice is inevitably viewed as being ‘soft on crime’, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For Democrats, especially Obama, the aim appears to be to avoid looking “weak and liberal” and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made.

#### Obama political capital is key to passage of immigration reform Foley[[3]](#footnote-3) 1/15

**Obama** has repeatedly said he **will** push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way. At least at first glance, **he seems to have politics on his side**. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.¶ Now **there's the question of how Obama gets there.** While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that **the president** can, and **must, play the role of broker** and statesman **to get a deal**.¶ It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.¶ In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. **The White House** also **needs to convince GOP lawmakers** **that there's support** from their constituents **for immigration** reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role **the president** will play, but sources say he **does plan to lead on the issue**. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership -- while keeping the president heavily involved.

Immigration reform curbs violence and crime from drug cartels, solves your impacts Wills 4-25[[4]](#footnote-4)

On Monday, Chris Crane, the union president of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), berated the recently proposed immigration reform bill during a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing."My initial impression of this bill, thus far, is that in large part it appears to have a lot of loopholes," Crane said shortly after confessing that he hadn't read the bill.For the past few weeks, Crane, an outspoken opponent of the legislation, has been a constant presence in conservative media. Along with Sheriffs from several states, he has repeatedly argued that the so-called Gang of Eight's bill doesn't do enough to promote enforcement and to protect America from a growing threat: Mexican cartels. "**We know that the drug cartels' troops and the soldiers are all within the interior of the United State**s as are many other criminal elements and criminal individuals," Crane said earlier this month. "There are people coming here for this to be a land of opportunity and there are people coming here because this is a target of opportunity. **We believe there is a very disproportionate number of criminals coming into the United States."** Indeed, there are recent reports that point to a . Los Zetas and the Sinaloa Cartel have been actively expanding their drug trafficking, money laundering, and enforcement activities in the U.S. in recent years. According to law enforcement officials and court records, the cartels have sent operatives north and recruited American gang members in their efforts to further develop their human smuggling, drug dealing, weapons trafficking, and extortion operations. So are Crane's fears warranted? **Will immigration reform lead the way to an increase in cartel presence in the United States?** Will it simplify cartel operations and increase violence in the southwest border? For most of the bill's supporters, the answer is a straightforward "No." The legislation includes a funding increase for Homeland Security that will pay for more unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), more fencing, more metrics, and for 3,500 new Customs and Border Patrol officers. It will create an entry/exit screening system, and it will also open the door for the government to gather information about the 11 million people who are currently in the shadows. **All of this further will increase border security and strengthen the fight against human smuggling and drug trafficking**, according to Homeland Security Janet Napolitano. "Knowing who [undocumented immigrants] are is critical for public safety," Napolitano said during a Senate hearing on Wednesday. Unfortunately, the story isn't that simple, according to several border security analysts. "The proposals sound great, they really do," Sylvia Longmire, a former Air Force investigator and the author of Cartel: The Coming Invasion of Mexico's Drug Wars, told ABC/Univision. "But the timeline in the bill is unrealistic. What's more, we've been trying to improve border security for years. Why would things suddenly change now?" The current draft of the immigration reform bill includes several provisions that could enhance border security, and others that could backfire and benefit Mexican criminals. "**I think immigration reform could be highly beneficial to curb the** general atmosphere of **illegality that aids the cartels' operations,**" **said** Ioan **Grillo**, author of El Narco: Inside Mexico's Criminal Insurgency, referring to the lack of legal oversight that permeates the lives of undocumented immigrants. "**When you have 10 or 11 million undocumented workers who are not recognized by the law, this creates an environment of illegality that criminal organizations can exploit." Crimes against undocumented immigrants are consistently underreported**, in large part because victims don't trust the police or are fearful or being deported. **Immigration reform would change that, and could lead to a large number of prosecutions if empowered victims step forward and report crimes to U.S. authorities**, Longmire says. "The one thing that could result from immigration reform is that people who are here illegally could be more forthcoming in reporting cartel activity to the police," Longmire said. At the same time, though, the economic and social benefits that the bill contemplates could work against the bill's beneficiaries, according to George W. Grayson, an Associate Scholar at the Foreign Policy Research Institute. Mexicans are the main targets of the Mexican cartels and quite possibly most cartel operatives in the U.S. are Mexican. Cartels have already followed the small exodus of Mexican nationals who have fled the country to escape the violence of the past years, Grayson says. In that sense, immigration reform could attract more criminal operatives by unwillingly establishing a vast an extortion market for groups such as the Sinaloa Cartel and Los Zetas. "If the immigration reform goes through," Grayson told ABC/Univision, "it will become more of a problem. That's not because undocumented immigrants are criminals, but because it will create a larger population of Mexicans that can be targets, or a larger population that can be employed by the cartels." The levels of violence that Mexico has witnessed are still far away, however. In fact, Grayson's scenario could be overblown, according to other analysts. The cartels operate in the U.S. following significantly different rules than they do in Mexico. While in south of the border they have established territorial control by buying off, threatening, and ultimately assuming control of local police, in the north they operate much more subtly, according to Grillo, taking care to avoid the gruesome murders that plague everyday life in Mexico. Moreover, as Longmire points out, cartels have been hiring American gang members to avoid calling attention to themselves. In effect, 80 percent of Border Patrol drug busts involve American citizens, according to the Center for Investigative Reporting. "Cartels already have individuals here that are American citizens and are already working for them," Longmire said. Taking that into account, she added, "I don't think immigration will have too much of an impact. It will be business as usual regardless of what happens."

### Drug trafficking and crime causes extreme amounts of terrorism. Wadhwa and Sheets[[5]](#footnote-5)

### Terrorist organizations in more than 30 countries now finance their activities through the highly profitable trade in prohibited drugs. In particular, drug trafficking has become increasingly important as a source of revenue for terrorist groups after the end of the Cold War. With the decline of state sponsored terrorism, terrorist groups were forced to find other means to finance their activities. Where the agricultural climate permitted, this could mean drug production and sales. Even if the climate and terrain were not suitable for the production of drugs, terrorist groups could nonetheless reap enormous profits from the sale of prohibited drugs. Insurgency and guerrilla warfare were threats that characterized the Cold War era. Drug trafficking, terrorism and crime are the growing threats in the post Cold War environment, and as we move into the 21st century, the transnational criminal or terrorist has become a more important actor.

Terrorism causes extinction. Ayson[[6]](#footnote-6)

The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, **if the act of nuclear terrorism came** as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) **suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors.** Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would [not ruling out] Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, **in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath** of the terrorist nuclear attack, **the** U.S. **president might be expected to place the country’s** armed forces, including its **nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert**. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that **Moscow or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use** force (and possibly **nuclear force) against them**. In that situation, the **temptations to preempt such actions might grow**, although it must be admitted that **[and] any preemption would** probably still **meet with a devastating response.** As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier)**Washington might decide to order a significant** conventional (or **nuclear**) retaliatory or disarming **attack against the** leadership of the terrorist **group** and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, **Russia or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and** potentially as **an infringement on their spheres of influence and** even on their **sovereignty**. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide.

#### Path to citizenship solves the deficit Tucker[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Recommendations for taming the deficit** include raising the retirement age, raising the federal gas tax and ending the mortgage interest deduction for homeowners. Ouch!¶ But there is a palliative that would ease the pain: **Put** 11 million **illegal immigrants on a path to legalization**. And don’t touch birthright citizenship!¶ Yes, you heard that right: **Granting** legal **residency to illegal immigrants will** eventually help sop up some of **the** federal **budget’s red ink**. I know that’s counterintuitive since so many citizens have come to believe that Mexican landscapers and Guatemalan maids are a drain on the treasury. But the fact is that **their** relative **youth is** just **what the** U.S. **economy needs**.¶ The **explosion of** the long-term **deficit is** largely **the consequence of** an **aging population, with more retirees depending on taxes from fewer workers**. While the recession, two unfunded wars and Bush-era tax cuts fueled the immediate deficit, a tsunami of long-term red ink will swamp the budget in about ten years, as a massive wave of baby boomers leaves the workplace.¶ So we need as many younger workers as we can find to help support the coming crush of senior citizens. The U.S. is lucky enough to have a higher birthrate than many other Westernized democracies, even among native-born women. Immigrants are an added demographic bonus.¶ “When some people think of immigrants, they think of people coming in and immediately absorbing our resources,” said Emory economist Jeffrey Rosensweig. “Most **immigrants come here to work**. They’re young workers, and they’re paying taxes.” **Why not add** all of **them to the** federal **tax rolls**?

#### Deficit will collapse hegemony and the economy---trigger global nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 – Zalmay Khalilzad, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security; If we don’t get our economic house in order, we risk a new era of multi-polarity,” online: [http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad" \t "_blank" \o "http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad)

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally.¶ **Such scenarios would reshape the international order**. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments.¶ We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the **higher risk of escalation.**¶ The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.¶ American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.¶ As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of **great-power competition**. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

#### Obama won’t spend PC on gun control---this ev’s comparative with immigration

Turner 12/14 Dan has been an editorial editor or writer with the LA Times since 2004. “Not another gun control diatribe,” 2012, <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-guns-connecticut-20121214,0,404849.story>

The latter argument is a little hard to make with a straight face in the case of Friday's shootings at an elementary school in Newtown, Conn.; I doubt even National Rifle Assn. chief Wayne LaPierre would claim that arming 6-year-olds or their teachers is a good idea. Regardless, the liberal blogosphere will scream for action, politicians will promise to take it, and then **they'll misplace that gun control bill** on the way to cut the ribbon for a new community center in their districts.¶ President Obama is a master at this kind of bait-and-switch tactic, regularly calling for a national conversation on gun violence in the wake of mass killings, or touting his support for a ban on assault rifles, **without doing anything whatsoever** to advance these causes. In a tearful news conference Friday, he promised to take "meaningful action to prevent more tragedies like this, regardless of the politics." And what action would that be? Obama knows that gun control is a political nonstarter. Advocates might be hoping he'll be more courageous now that he has won a second term, but if history is a guide, he will save his political capital for fights he can win, such as immigration reform, and dump issues that fire up conservative opposition, such as climate controls and, yes, gun control. Smart politician. Disappointing leader.

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9 Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article\_opinion?id=161426968

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be **difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised**, let alone all of it. Reality will **force him to make many "u" turns** and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a **vast accumulation of political capital**, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and **fast diminishing asset** in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is **rarely ever renewable**. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who **did not know how to husband** the **political capital** with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, **some promises have to be deferred** beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that **American politics is not a winner-take-all system**. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting **anything done politically**, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, **requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading.** No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### PC is finite---fights on one issue make pushing others harder

Hayward 12 John is a writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a **finite amount of political capital** in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.

#### Immigration reform key to hegemony – both hard and soft power

Nye 12/10/12 (Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>, CMR)

The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### Extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately**,** we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**.** We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### 4

#### Disad outweighs –

#### SPEED – immigration vote coming soon and failure will lock-in collapse of US economic power and cultural influence, crushing global hegemony – aff impacts are long-term and solved by future policymakers

#### SCOPE – hegemony controls and mitigates the escalation of all global conflict – collapses causes great power nuclear war – err neg since it’s the only impact supported by history and statistics

#### Immigration will pass by the summer – PC is key and no thumpers -- this evidence is phenomenal

Chris Weignat 1/23 Political writer and blogger with the Huffington Post, “Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term\_b\_2537802.html

Realistically, Obama's only going to have anywhere from a few months to (at most) a year and a half to get anything accomplished. Which is why he is right to push his agenda immediately, as evidenced by his inaugural speech. But even he must realize that he's not going to get everything he wants, so it will be interesting to see what makes it through Congress and what dies an ignoble legislative death. There is reason for hope. Obama begins from a position of strength, politically. His job approval ratings have been consistently over 50 percent since he was re-elected -- a range Obama hasn't seen since 2009. As mentioned, the Republican presence in both houses of Congress has shrunk. More importantly, though, the House Republicans are visibly chastened (or even "shaken") by the election's outcome. This has already allowed Obama to rack up two early victories in the endless budget debates -- and in both, Obama got almost everything he asked for, did not give up much of anything, and held firm on some very bold negotiating tactics. Obama won the fight over the fiscal cliff, which resulted in the first rise in income tax rates in two decades, and the only thing he had to budge on was the threshold for these higher taxes. Today, the House Republicans passed a "clean" rise in the debt ceiling, after Obama swore over and over again that he "was not going to negotiate" on the issue at all. The score so far is: Obama two, House Republicans zero (to put it in sporting terms). Of course, the Republicans only extended the debt ceiling for a few months, but this shouldn't really worry anyone, because a longer-term extension will doubtlessly be a part of any sort of grand bargain on the budget talks. The Republicans, very wisely, realized they were playing a losing game and decided to reshuffle the deadlines on the calendar. Rather than being faced with the debt ceiling crisis first, and then two budgetary crises, they have moved the debt ceiling problem to the end of the list. Which means the next big fight Obama faces is going to be another haggle over the budget. This is going to be a tough battle, and Obama is bound to disappoint some of his supporters in the midst of it. Some sacred cows are going to wind up as hamburger, although at this point it's hard to see which ones. The real measurement of success here will be whether the House Republicans and Obama can come to terms with a budget for the next year or year-and-a-half. Long-term budget stability has been largely absent from Washington for a while now, so if any agreement can be reached perhaps it'll help the economy recover a lot faster throughout 2013 and 2014. In the long run, that will be a positive thing, no matter what such a budget agreement actually contains. One safe bet for what will be in it, though, is a long-term extension of the debt ceiling. Budget battles are going to happen no matter what else does -- that's another safe bet. What is more interesting, though, is handicapping which of Obama's agenda items will actually see some action. There are three major initiatives that Obama is currently pushing: action on global warming, comprehensive immigration reform, and gun control. Obama did mention other issues in his speech, but these are the big three for now. Gay marriage, for instance, is in the hands of the Supreme Court right now, and no matter how they rule it's hard to see any legislative action (good or bad) happening on it immediately afterwards. Gun control will likely be the first of these debated in Congress. Vice President Biden laid out a wide array of possible actions Congress could take on the issue, all of which Obama then backed. While the Newtown massacre did indeed shift public opinion dramatically on the overall issue, the biggest initiative is not likely to become law. An assault rifle ban is very important to some Democrats, but the way I read it is that this was included to have something to "trade away" in the negotiations. If Obama gets most of the other gun control initiatives -- closing loopholes on background checks, much better tracking of weapons, and all the other "small bore" (sorry about that pun) ideas -- then he will at least be able to say he accomplished something at the end of the day. Perhaps this is pessimistic, but the mechanics of banning "assault weapons" become very tricky, when you have to actually define what they are in legal language. And such a ban may not get universal Democratic backing anyway, so I fully expect this will be shelved at some point in exchange for support for all the other initiatives. Without such a ban, the prospects for other meaningful gun control legislation get a lot better, though, and I think that a bill will eventually pass. The second big agenda item is immigration reform. President Obama holds virtually all the cards, politically, on this one. All Republicans who can read either demographics or polling numbers know full well that this may be their party's last chance not to go the way of the Whigs. Their support among Latinos is dismal, and even that's putting it politely. Some Republicans think they have come up with a perfect solution on how to defuse the issue, but they are going to be proven sadly mistaken in the end, I believe. The Republican plan will be announced by Senator Marco Rubio at some point, and it will seem to mirror the Democratic plan -- with one key difference. Republicans -- even the ones who know their party has to do something on the immigration problem -- are balking at including a "path to citizenship" for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in America. The Republicans are trying to have their cake and eat it too -- and it's not going to work. "Sure," they say, "we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." This just isn't going to be good enough, though. There are essentially two things citizens can do which green card holders cannot: serve on juries, and vote. The Republicans are not worried about tainted juries, in case that's not clear enough. Republicans will bend over backwards in an effort to convince Latinos that their proposal will work out just fine for everyone. Latinos, however, aren't stupid. They know that being denied any path to citizenship equals an effort to minimize their voice on the national political stage. Which is why, as I said, Obama holds all the cards in this fight. Because this is the one issue in his agenda which Republicans also have a big vested interest in making happen. Obama and the Democrats will, I believe, hold firm on their insistence on a path to citizenship, and I think a comprehensive immigration bill will likely pass some time this year, perhaps before the summer congressional break. The path to citizenship it includes will be long, expensive and difficult (Republicans will insist on at least that), but it will be there. On gun control, I think Obama will win a partial victory. On immigration, I think he will win an almost-total victory. On global warming, however, he's going to be disappointed. In fact, I doubt -- no matter how much "bully pulpiting" Obama does -- that any bill will even appear out of a committee in either house of Congress. This will be seen as Obama's "overreach" -- a bridge too far for the current political climate. Anyone expecting big legislative action on global warming is very likely going to be massively disappointed, to put it quite bluntly. In fact, Obama will signal this in the next few months, as he approves the Keystone XL pipeline -- much to the dismay of a lot of his supporters. Of course, I could be wrong about any or all of these predictions. I have no special knowledge of how things will work out in Congress in the immediate future. I'm merely making educated guesses about what Obama will be able to achieve in at least the first few years of his second term. Obama has a lot of political capital right now, but that could easily change soon. The House Republicans seem almost demoralized right now, and Obama has successfully splintered them and called their bluff on two big issues already -- but they could regroup and decide to block everything the White House wants, and damn the political consequences. Unseen issues will pop up both on the domestic and foreign policy stages, as they always do. But, for now, this is my take on how the next few years are going to play out in Washington. Time will tell whether I've been too optimistic or too pessimistic on any or all of Obama's main agenda items. We'll just have to wait and see.

#### Will pass – pc gets GOP on board

Rosalind S. Helderman and David Nakamura 1/25 “Senators nearing agreement on broad immigration reform proposal”, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/senators-nearing-agreement-on-broad-immigration-reform-proposal/2013/01/25/950fb78a-6642-11e2-9e1b-07db1d2ccd5b\_story.html

A working group of senators from both parties is nearing agreement on broad principles for overhauling the nation’s immigration laws, representing the most substantive bipartisan effort toward major legislation in years.¶ The three Democrats and three Republicans, who have been meeting quietly in recent months, plan to announce a final agreement as early as next Friday.¶ The move would amount to the first tentative step toward comprehensive immigration reform after long-standing gridlock on the issue. The new effort was spurred in large part by the growing influence of Latino voters who strongly backed President Obama and other Democrats in November.¶ Obama has also called immigration reform one of his top legislative priorities and is launching his own public campaign on the issue next week in Nevada. But a significant number of Americans, particularly within the Republican Party, remain opposed to laws that would make it easier for illegal immigrants to stay in the country or obtain legal status.¶ The senators are expected to call for normalizing the status of the nation’s 11 million undocumented immigrants, including allowing those with otherwise clean criminal records to obtain legal work permits, officials said. The group is also likely to endorse stricter border controls and a better system for employers to verify the immigration status of workers.¶ It was not clear, however, whether the final agreement will offer guidance on perhaps the thorniest issue in the immigration debate: what mechanism illegal immigrants could use to pursue full citizenship.¶ “We have basic agreement on many of the core principles,” Senate Majority Whip Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.), a member of the group, said this week. “Now we have to draft it. It takes time.”¶ Other senators involved in the talks are Democrats Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.) and Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) and Republicans Lindsey O. Graham (S.C.), John McCain (Ariz.) and Marco Rubio (Fla.).¶ Two others, Sens. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) and Michael F. Bennet (D-Colo.), have also been involved in some of the discussions.¶ Congressional aides stress that a final agreement has not yet been reached. But the negotiations mark the most in-depth immigration talks involving members of both parties since a similar attempt broke down in 2010 without producing a bill.¶ McCain, who spearheaded an earlier failed effort in 2007, said Republican attitudes have dramatically shifted since the party’s losses at the polls in November. Obama won more than 70 percent of the vote among Latinos and Asians, and a growing number of GOP leaders believe that action on immigration is necessary to expand the party’s appeal to minority groups.¶ “Obviously, it’s had a very distinct impression,” said McCain, who lost his own bid for the White House in 2008. “It’s time to move forward on this.”¶ But, he added, “I don’t claim that it’s going to be easy.”¶ The accelerated pace signals that immigration reform is expected to be one of Congress’s highest priorities, and it comes as the White House prepares to launch its own public campaign on the issue.¶ Obama will travel to Las Vegas on Tuesday to speak about the need to “fix the broken immigration system this year,” the administration announced Friday. Nevada has a rapidly growing number of Hispanic voters, who overwhelmingly supported Obama’s reelection.¶ Obama also met with members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus on Friday, and aides said he vowed that immigration reform will be his “top priority.”¶ “What has been absent in the time [since] he put principles forward is a willingness by Republicans to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform,” White House press secretary Jay Carney said Friday. “He hopes that dynamic has changed and there are indications what was once a bipartisan effort to push forward . . . will again be a bipartisan effort to do so.”¶ Past efforts begun amid similarly high hopes have sputtered.¶ In 2007, a bill crafted in the Senate died after failing to win support of 60 members despite backing from President George W. Bush. Many Republicans, and some centrist Democrats, opposed that effort because it offered a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants.¶ In 2010, extended negotiations between Graham and Schumer broke down without producing legislation.¶ The timetable would aim for a bill to be written by March or April and potentially considered for final passage in the Senate as early as the summer. Proponents think a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate would make it easier to win adoption in the GOP-held House.¶ The working group’s principles are expected to address stricter border control, better employer verification of workers’ immigration status, new visas for temporary agriculture workers and expanding the number of visas available for skilled engineers. They would also include a call to normalize the status of the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants and help young people who were brought to the country illegally as children become citizens.¶ But obstacles abound. For instance, Rubio has said he thinks immigrants who came to the country illegally should be able to earn a work permit but should be required to seek citizenship through existing avenues after those who have come here legally.¶ Many Democrats and immigration advocates fear Rubio’s approach would result in wait-times stretching for decades, creating a class of permanent legal residents for whom the benefits of citizenship appear unattainable. They have pushed to create new pathways to citizenship specifically available to those who achieve legal residency as part of a reform effort.¶ It is not yet clear whether the Senate group will endorse a mechanism allowing such people to eventually become citizens — something Obama is expected to champion. Schumer said it would be “relatively detailed” but would not “get down into the weeds.”¶ A source close to Rubio said he joined the group in December at the request of other members only after they agreed their effort would line up with his own principles for reform. As a possible 2016 presidential contender widely trusted on the right, Rubio could be key to moving the bipartisan effort.¶ Rubio and other Republicans have said they would prefer to split up a comprehensive immigration proposal into smaller bills that would be voted on separately, but the White House will pursue comprehensive legislation that seeks to reform the process in a single bill.¶ “I doubt if there will be a macro, comprehensive bill,” said Sen. Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.), who supported the 2007 effort. “Anytime a bill’s more than 500 pages, people start getting suspicious. If it’s 2,000 pages, they go berserk.”¶ But Schumer said Friday that a single package will be key for passage. “We’ll not get it done in pieces,” he said. “Every time you do a piece, everyone says what about my piece, and you get more people opposing it.”¶ Eliseo Medina, secretary treasurer of the Service Employees International Union, which spent millions recruiting Hispanic voters last year, said immigration advocates expect Obama to be out front on the issue.¶ “The president needs to lead and then the Republicans have a choice,” Medina said. “The best way to share the credit is for them to step up and engage and act together with the president.”

#### Obama is ramping up push for immigration reform --- it’s a top priority and quick action expected

Meckler, 1/25 (Laura, Dow Jones Top North American Equities Stories, “Obama May Talk Immigration Overhaul Next Week,” Factiva, CMR)

WASHINGTON--President Barack Obama will travel to Las Vegas next week for a speech that that could serve as the starter's gun for the drive to overhaul immigration laws.¶ Mr. Obama has said that overhauling national immigration policy is one of his top priorities for 2013, and he has laid out what he hopes to see in the legislation. But the speech, set for Tuesday, is meant to "help prod the process along," said one of the people familiar with his plans.¶ "He is using the megaphone that he has to say, 'You guys need to act on this,'" this person said. A second person confirmed Mr. Obama's plans.¶ A White House official said that Mr. Obama would travel to Las Vegas but would not discuss the topic of his remarks.¶ The speech comes as a group of eight senators working on immigration legislation nears a self-imposed February deadline for putting out principles for a bill. The group hopes to have legislative language by March and to pass a bill through the Senate by August.¶ The process is expected to move more slowly in the House, where some Republicans have expressed interest in similar legislation and others are vocally opposed.¶ The senators' plan is expected to include the same elements that Mr. Obama has long supported: stepped up border security, a better system that employers use to verify that potential hires are in the U.S. legally, more visas for high-tech workers, a temporary worker program for lower-skilled workers and a path to citizenship for some 11 million people now in the U.S. illegally.¶ It was unclear how specific Mr. Obama would be next week about what elements he wants in an immigration bill. During his first term, he laid out his principles publicly, though it has been some time since the president spoke about them in detail.¶ The White House also has prepared legislative language, and some have urged that the president send it to Capitol Hill as a way of moving the legislative process forward. But others argue that putting specific legislation forward could derail the process, potentially causing political problems for some Republicans involved who want distance between their work and the White House.¶ One person familiar with events said that the White House has told allies that the purpose of the speech is to show that Mr. Obama is engaged in the issue and not just sitting back, waiting for Congress to act.¶ "He wants to try and influence the process and move it forward," said Angela Kelley, an immigration expert at the liberal think tank Center for American Progress. "He wants to nudge this along."¶ White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said Thursday that Mr. Obama wanted to work with people from both parties to move legislation to his desk.¶ "I think you can expect him to be true to his word, which is to take up this issue very early in his second term," he said.¶ He said the White House put out details of what the president would like to see in a bill long ago. "He does absolutely believe that we need to do this in a comprehensive way," Mr. Carney said of the president.¶ Many, though not all, Democrats have supported a multi-pronged immigration bill, but other issues took precedence. Before the November election there was little support or urgency among Republican lawmakers for a broad immigration bill. But after Mr. Obama won reelection with overwhelming support from Hispanics, many Republicans said they would support the effort, giving it new life in Congress.

#### Immigration reform will pass – top priority and national GOP support

Kevin Freking 1/20 Boston.com, http://www.boston.com/news/politics/2012/president/candidates/obama/2013/01/20/obama-adviser-optimistic-immigration-reform/Wjj0yJsCqKYaiKr0FTvu3N/story.html

A top White House adviser said Sunday the stars seem aligned for Congress to pass a comprehensive immigration overhaul this year, but he sounded less confident about prospects for toughening the nation’s gun laws.¶ White House Senior Adviser David Plouffe made the rounds on Sunday talk shows, outlining the president’s agenda for the months ahead. He said past presidents have been able to make significant progress during their second terms, noting that President Ronald Reagan pushed through more tax cuts and that President Bill Clinton helped transform budget deficits into budget surpluses.¶ He said Obama’s focus will be on improving the economy, saying the president believes the best way to do that is to invest in education and manufacturing while also seeking what he called ‘‘balanced deficit reduction.’’¶ Republicans agreed to let tax cuts expire this year for those workers whose incomes exceed $400,000 a year, but Plouffe said that future negotiations on reducing the deficit will have to include more tax revenue as well as spending cuts and changes to entitlement programs.¶ ‘‘We've dealt with the tax rate issue. Now it’s about loopholes,’’ Plouffe said on ABC. ‘‘And I think the country would be well-served by tax and entitlement reform, because it'll help our economy.’’¶ Beyond the economy and the budget, Plouffe indicated that two social issues will be a focus at the outset of the president’s second term: immigration and gun control.¶ On gun control, he mixed statements of optimism with an acknowledgement of political realities. Republicans control the House, and even some Democrats in the Senate have been extremely cautious in addressing the issue.¶ ‘‘It’s going to be very, very hard,’’ Plouffe said on CBS’s ‘‘Face the Nation.’’¶ Republican Sen. John Barrasso of Wyoming underscored that point. He said he doubted supporters could get 60 votes in the Senate for legislation allowing universal background checks for gun purchasers and for limiting gun magazines to 10 rounds and under.¶ ‘‘The debt and spending. That’s where people are focused. That’s the big anxiety of this country,’’ Barrasso said on CNN.¶ Sen. Roy Blunt, R-Mo., would not answer whether he could support background checks for every gun purchase. Without getting into specifics, he advocated for better information-sharing to prevent some people with mental health problems from buying guns.¶ ‘‘Let’s do things that will make a difference here, rather than take one more opportunity to go at an old agenda,’’ Blunt, a gun-rights advocate, said on Fox News Sunday.¶ When it comes to overhauling the nation’s immigration laws, Plouffe said he believes there’s broader support from Republicans nationally than there is from Republicans in Congress. Still, ‘‘the stars are aligned’’ for a bill to include beefing up border security as well as giving those already in the U.S. illegally a path to citizenship. He cited business organizations and religious leaders as key players backing a comprehensive immigration bill.

#### Obama is pushing Comprehensive Immigration Reform and it will pass – it’s top of the agenda

Sandra Hernandez, LA Times Staff, 1/19/13, “Who stands to lose more if immigration reform fails?”, http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-immigration-reform-obama-20130118,0,5616515.story

As President Obama’s second term gets underway, there is a growing debate about whether comprehensive immigration reform will remain a priority given the ambitious agenda he has outlined, including the need to address the budget, tax reform, climate change and gun violence. So far, the White House continues to say that immigration reform is on the front burner. More important, the administration is acting as if it is a priority. This week, for example, administration officials met with key members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to discuss how to push forward legislation. Also this week, Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), who heads up the Senate Judiciary Committee, announced that the committee would probably take up the issue next month. And already, some bipartisan discussions are underway. Outside Washington, business and religious leaders say they consider immigration reform a top legislative priority and are launching a grass-roots drive to build support. Yet some advocates and observers remain skeptical that federal lawmakers will actually move forward with new laws. Why? Well, for starters because any type of effort to overhaul the immigration system will require support from moderate Republicans, such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). He concedes that his party needs to improve its standing with Latino voters, who overwhelming cast their ballots for Obama, even in states that traditionally vote for a Republican candidate. But just how far Rubio and others are willing to go on the most vexing aspect of immigration reform remains a question. Rubio and other moderates have signaled their support for legislation that would provide legal status to so-called Dreamers, or young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States unlawfully as children. And those same lawmakers will likely back plans to provide more visas for high-skilled workers and foreign students who earn advanced degrees from U.S. universities in math, science and engineering. But those GOP lawmakers may fall short of supporting legislation that would provide a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants already here. The party’s conservative base has traditionally opposed such efforts because some argue it's little more than amnesty that rewards immigrants who broke the rules. But I disagree with those who believe immigration reform is once again doomed. I think both parties understand they would pay a high price with Latino voters.

#### Immigration reform will pass – bipartisan push

David S Jones, Global Immigration Blog, 1/22/13, “Momentum Grows for Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, http://www.globalimmigrationblog.com/2013/01/articles/us-immigration/momentum-grows-for-comprehensive-immigration-reform/

Lawmakers return to Washington for the 113th Congress with comprehensive immigration reform once again moving to the front burner. Comments and proposals are being fielded by prominent political figures, including former President George W. Bush http://trailblazersblog.dallasnews.com/2012/12/george-w-bush-debate-immigration-policy-with-a-benevolent-spirit.html/ and Senator Marco Rubio http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323442804578235844003050604.html. These and similar calls for Congress to finally address the country’s immigration system, widely criticized as “broken” on both sides of the aisle, seem to be resonating with the White House, at least mildly http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/citing-rubios-ideas-on-immigration-reform-white-house-sees-hope-for-bipartisan-deal/2013/01/15/d83f4102-5f48-11e2-9940-6fc488f3fecd\_story.html. The growth of bipartisan support for comprehensive immigration reform may move the Administration and Congress to initiate a new push to enact immigration reform legislation as early as this March. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid recently noted publicly that a bipartisan group of senators, led by Democratic Sens. Chuck Schumer and Dick Durbin and Republican Sens. John McCain and Lindsey Graham, have been crafting an immigration package and that this was to be “first thing” on the Senate’s agenda. While the exact scope and language is still being discussed, all indications are that the Administration is looking to pass comprehensive legislation that addresses multiple elements of immigration reform. Key elements of any comprehensive solution include: mandatory verification of legal status of newly hired workers, additional visa numbers for highly skilled immigrants and creation of a temporary guest-worker program. Reform legislation also is expected to address the approximately 11 million individuals currently residing in the U.S. without legal status.

#### Immigration reform will pass – it’s a top priority, but push will be key

Stacy Kaper and Rebecca Kaplan, NationalJournal, 1/21/13, “What Obama Wants and What Congress Will Give Him”, http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/what-obama-wants-and-what-congress-will-give-him-20130121

Immigration reform: The president has made no secret of the fact that he is going to make comprehensive immigration reform a top priority of his second term. There is some bipartisan support, especially in the Senate, for legislation, but several sticking points remain. Lawmakers disagree on whether there should be a path to citizenship or merely legal status for illegal immigrants, and whether it should be presented as a comprehensive bill or several smaller pieces of legislation. And for immigration reform to pass in the House, Speaker John Boehner might have to violate the Hastert rule and bring legislation to the floor without the majority backing of his conference. Obama voiced support for one specific policy, arguing that immigration reform would be incomplete “until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country.” Easing the path to citizenship for high-skilled workers enjoys broad bipartisan support in the House and Senate, but will get caught up in the debate about the size of legislation.

#### Will pass and Obama push

David Nakamura and Felicia Sonmez, Washington Post, 1/15/13, “Citing Rubio’s ideas on immigration reform, White House sees hope for bipartisan deal”, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-15/politics/36384567\_1\_immigration-reform-illegal-immigrants-legal-status

The Obama administration suggested Tuesday that there are signs that bipartisan cooperation might be possible on immigration reform, in light of some new ideas being championed by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.). White House press secretary Jay Carney said that Rubio’s proposals to offer more visas to highly skilled tech workers and potentially provide legal status and citizenship to many of the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants “bode well for a productive, bipartisan debate.” “We hope that it signals a change in the Republican approach to this issue,” Carney said during his daily briefing, “because if we are going to get this done, it’s going to take more than just a handful of Republicans working across the aisle.” President Obama has promised a vigorous push for comprehensive immigration reform — including a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants — early in his second term.

#### Will pass

Associated Press, Arkansas Online, 1/20/13, “Obama adviser optimistic on immigration reform”, http://www.arkansasonline.com/news/2013/jan/20/obama-adviser-optimistic-immigration-reform/?f=latest

WASHINGTON — A top White House adviser said the stars seemed aligned for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform this year. Speaking Sunday on CNN’s “State of the Union,” David Plouffe said support for reform is strong among lawmakers, the business community and the American people. He said there’s, quote, “no reason” immigration reform shouldn’t move through Congress this year.

#### Obama’s leadership and prioritization of immigration reform key to passage

Castro, 12 (Tony, 11/13/2012, “What Spielberg’s ‘Lincoln’ tells Obama about immigration reform,” <http://www.voxxi.com/lincoln-obama-immigration-reform/>)

¶ For Lincoln, as the film portrays him, was not a political saint but a masterful politician, something that cannot fully be said of Obama, at least on negotiating passage of any significant legislation other than Affordable Health Care.¶ Comprehensive immigration reform may prove to be an even greater test for Obama.¶ The challenge will be whether Obama is willing to undertake immigration reform legislation as the first priority of his second term—the way Lincoln chose to push for the 13th Amendment as soon as he was re-elected—and whether he is skillful enough on using all the spoils of office at his disposal to win over the necessary votes.
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